DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 976 SP 020 055

AUTHOR Putnam, Joyce G.
TITLE Planning for a Classroom Learning Community and the Implications for Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Environment; Classroom Techniques; *Cooperative Planning; *Decision Making; Elementary Education; Ethnography; *Group Dynamics; Helping Relationship; Heterogeneous Grouping; Individual Development; *Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Education; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

A year-long case study was made of an elementary school teacher and her first and second grade students in a classroom considered typical of a learning community, an environment that emphasizes collaborative planning between teacher and students. Three aspects of planning were found directly related to this sort of collaboration. First, the teacher reflected upon what she knew about her students, individual and group responsibility objectives, content objectives, and resources. Second, the teacher and pupils planned objectives and activities together. Third, the teacher considered the probability of individual student success. Other key learning community characteristics identified from this study were task and objective monitoring systems, heterogeneous grouping, individual responsibility, and group responsibility for learning. The teacher was conscious of her belief that the primary function of schooling was personal responsibility (evidenced by academic learning) and social responsibility (evidenced by students helping others to learn). The teacher used information gained during collaborative planning sessions to help determine actual objectives for individual pupils. A description is presented of the teacher's mental assessment and planning prior to the collaborative planning sessions, the teacher and pupil collaborative planning sessions, and a study episode which resulted from the planning. Implications of and suggestions from this study for teacher educations are discussed. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215976

American Educational Research Association
New York, New York
March, 1982

Planning for a Classroom Learning Community

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joyce G. Putnam

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Joyce G. Putnam
Associate Professor of Education
Michigan State University
College of Education
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 020 055

Planning for a Classroom Learning Community and the Implications for Teacher Education

Joyce G. Putnam
Associate Professor of Education
Michigan State University
College of Education
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Teacher and Pupil Planning

This study is based on the assumption that rich descriptions of effective classroom teachers' curriculum development and implementation efforts are necessary for the improvement of teacher education. The teacher and classroom were selected for this research because of the importance of studying an effective teacher who articulates a particular philosophical view. The classroom studied was designed by the teacher to represent that view and functioned in what Schwab (1976) describes as a learning community.

This report focuses on the planning which occurs in that learning community classroom. Two types of planning and the resulting study episode are described. The two types of planning are teacher assessment and pupil/teacher collaborative selection of content and methods.

This paper contains three major sections. The first section presents the overview of the study. Section two includes a description of the teacher's assessment, teacher and pupil collaborative planning sessions, and the study episode which resulted from the planning. The third section includes a discussion of implications this research has for teacher education.

Section I
Overview

This first section of this paper includes a discussion about the Learning Community classroom, purpose of this study, procedures for this study, context of this study, and an overview of findings.

Learning Community Classrooms

Classrooms which function as learning communities have certain identifiable characteristics. These characteristics may be described as follows.

(Schwab, 1979). The problems to be solved by the classroom group typically require the interdependent thought, action, and cooperation of persons having a variety of backgrounds, talents, and abilities. The planning and instructional approach used provides opportunities for the group to achieve a sense of common purpose and satisfaction as a result of communication and collaboration. Record keeping systems monitor task completion and the acquisition of basic skills which allow for individuals to be intentionally placed in heterogeneous groups. The use of heterogeneous groups encourages the students to contribute their diverse strengths to collective problems. Organization and management systems are designed to promote individual and group responsibility, a sense of shared membership, individuality, and reciprocity in relationships. In such classrooms planning and teaching is not the function of the teacher alone. Planning and instructional experiences are often provided through various configurations. The presence of many adults and older or younger schoolmates as contributing members is taken as a natural part of the learning community. (Barnes, et al., 1979)

There is emerging evidence that the social context of the classroom can effectively promote academic achievement and at the same time development of unusually high levels of individual and social responsibility. For example, King (1971) has pointed out that each classroom is a cultural system--a subsystem of the school which, in turn, is a subsystem of the society. "Students learn to participate in the classroom system first ..." This was consistent with Young and Beardsley (1968) who also support that the structure of classroom interaction is important for learning.

O'Daffer (1976) suggests that students need interaction with others in order to maximize their potential as learners:

> When students work in groups and communicate more often with each other and with the classroom teacher, changes are affected in their approach. This personal recognition from others, both peer and teacher, is a basic need that must be considered. (p. 27)

Robinson (1976) reported an experimental study in mathematics education in which students were trained to work cooperatively. Not only did she find positive results in improved math skills, but she reports other positive effects of team work. In her words the students were:

> ...taught an attitude of cooperation, pulling together, helping others, sharing problems and solutions, and, indeed, unashamedly asking for help, all necessary values for today's world citizen. (p. 206)

Bossert (1979) suggested that self-directed work behavior among elementary school pupils was associated with activity experiences in which direct teacher control was minimal. Students in classrooms that relied heavily on group recitation and seatwork--tasks which entail high levels of teacher control--showed little self-directed behavior when confronted with new, fairly undefined activity settings. While learning to work alone, these students were dependent on their teachers for specification of proper work procedures. By contrast, the children who were encouraged to choose and organize their own tasks learned to begin new activities on their own without waiting for detailed instruction. Thus, there seems to be a growing body of evidence to demonstrate that the approach to instruction called learning community has merit. Because of the clear philosophy expressed and the support for this type of classroom in the literature, the learning community was selected as one form of instruction to study in order to demonstrate how philosophy influences planning.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study was to capture the dynamics of this classroom

and to be able to understand how the learning community philosophy is translated into plans and activities. To facilitate the initiation of the study we asked the following questions:

1. What characteristics of the school and classroom environment appear to be important to the creation of learning community?

2. What skills are acquired in the content of a learning community that may not be intended or expected in the usual school curriculum (unintended outcomes--e.g., cooperation, tolerance for differences, collaboration with others in work, etc.)?

The research questions were derived from what anthropologist's refer to as a embryonic hypothesis about the qualities of a certain teacher's classroom as a learning community. (Schwab, 1976) The initial hypothesis for this study was based on data collected during visitations to the classroom over a six year peroid of time; from interviews conducted by experts in the field of education (Lanier, Shulman); and pupil gains that 1974-75 averaged 1.6 years in 1974-75 and 1.9 years in 1975-76. The researcher felt that this classroom environment was close to what Schwab (1958) had called a "Learning Community." During the seven years she was teaching, Ms. Jeannie LaSovage consistently emphasized cognitive learning with special attention to basic skills while promoting social responsibility and the development of individuality in her students. LaSovage also was an articulate individual who demonstrated an awareness of her decision-making as a teacher, a quality which made her especially suitable for a participant observer study. This study began then from the general notion that the researcher and other interested teacher educators thought they knew what a learning community looked like, they felt it was important, and they had a hunch about where to find one. As Strauss (et al.) pointed out, the field with specific hypotheses and a set research design, however, s/he "... does

have general problems in mind, as well as a theoretical framework that directs him to certain events in the field." (McCall and Simmons, 1969, p. 25)

Procedures of This Study

Because we wanted to learn about the dynamics of the classroom when it is consciously planned and conducted to generate a learning community, we needed the most contextually revealing and enriching method of study we could find. Thus, we selected the techniques of ethnography which are rooted in anthropology and sociology. Erickson (1977) has asserted that what it does best is:

> ... to describe key incidents in functionally relevant descriptive terms and place them in some relation to wider social context, using the key incidents as a concrete instance of the working of abstract principles of social organization. (p. 61)

Further, we believed with Wolf and Tymitz (1977) that "naturalistic inquiry helps to illuminate the complexity of human developments and interactions ..."

The project was a single case study in which the data collection was carried out over one school year using the methods and perspective of ethnographic fieldwork. The focus was on the teacher (LaSovage) and her first and second grade morning class.

Documents were collected from the teacher, children, school administration, and aides. The documents included student products, sociograms, maps of special and temporal relationships, and teacher planning products.

Data collection was intensive during the first three weeks of the academic school year. The reason for the intensive data collection for this period of time was based on studies by Tikunoff and Ward (1979) and Evertson and Anderson (1979), which indicate that classroom experiences at the beginning of the year were very important for what transpired thereafter. Thus, the initial intensive data collection period contributed

to the knowledge about how a teacher plans and establishes the environment of a classroom. Data collection throughout the rest of the year was continued on a scheduled but less intensive basis.

Context of This Study

The classroom chosen for this study was located in a midwest consolidated rural school district. The district covers 154 square miles of 4 counties, 8 townships and 3 rural villages. The district serves a diverse, but predominately low socioeconomic population. The rural area includes farmers; blue collar workers; persons on welfare; and a small Mexican/American-Chicano population, some of whom are migrant and some permanent residents in the district. Due to the physical size of the district, most students were bussed, some as far as 75 miles one way. The district's student enrollment was 2,044 with approximately 8% of the student population Hispanic in origin.

The consolidated school district was composed of three school buildings, three elementary, one middle and one high school. In addition, central administrators (superintendent and assistant superintendent) were housed in a separate three room building.

The classroom studied was one of three portables located next to a K-6 grade school. The classroom was located directly outside one wing of the building and faced the playground.

The local community in which the school buildings were located has a population of approximately 3,000. The town evolved outward from a town square, with the business district located within the four block area a block from the square. Few sidewalks exist in the neighborhood consisting of single dwelling homes beyond the immediate town square. The County Library is located in the center of town within a short walking distance from one elementary, the middle and high schools.

Overview of Findings

The characteristic identified as the essence of a learning community classroom was collaborative decision making between teacher and students. We found three aspects of planning directly related to this sort of collaboration. First, the teacher reflected upon what she knew about her students, individual and group responsibility objectives, content objectives, and resources. Second and most important, the teacher and pupils actually planned objectives and activities together. Third, the teacher considered the probability of individual student success, given the jointly designed unit of study. In predicting success the teacher decided a) whether the collaborative plan would be implemented or a new one designed and b) whether activities would be organized around small groups of students doing the activity or if multiple activities would go on simultaneously.

Other key learning community characteristics identified were 1) task and objective monitoring systems, 2) heterogeneous grouping, 3) individual responsibility, and 4) group responsibility for learning, i.e., how to ask for help, offer help, and actually help.

In addition to the characteristics described above we found that the teacher was conscious of her belief that the primary function of schooling was personal and social responsibility. The major personal responsibility was academic learning. The major social responsibility was to help others learn. A second finding is that she used information gained during collaborative planning sessions to help determine actual objectives for individual pupils. Third, one of the reasons that she believed that student motivation and resonsibility were gained f om participation in decision making about their work.

The following section details the types of planning mentioned above. It also provides a description of the "study episode" which is the result of teacher and pupil planning. The key orienting questions for this report are: 1) What happened during collaborative planning? 2) Why did the teacher hold collaborative planning sessions? 3) How did the teacher prepare for the collaborative planning? 4) What resulted from the collaborative planning.

Section II

Teacher and Pupil Planning in a Learning Community Classroom

On the first day of school in Ms. Jeannie LaSovage's first and second grade morning class, the students participated in decision making about the content of activities. During this study the characteristic of pupil participation in decisions about curriculum, content and process, environment, group process and individual behavior. The characteristics of teacher/pupil collaborative decision making evolved into a system which allowed pupils and teacher to discuss, plan, problem solve and make decisions through collaboration. Following is a partial description of the first day of class. The description is followed by a list of the eight characteristics identified on the first day of class. These characteristics were identified as key elements of this learning community classroom.

The First Day

> The classroom was prepared for the first day of class. The teacher had a printed label with each child's name. The room was divided into three parts. The front part of the room contained one desk for each student, a "teacher's desk" (frequently used by students during the year), a two-story loft, a seven foot bench, a chalk board, bulletin board, a cubby box or shelf for each student to keep things. No elaborate teacher-made bulletin boards existed. The other two parts of the room were set up with round tables and chairs for small groups to work.

As the students entered the room the teacher greeted each one of the first or second graders calling them by name or asking their name. She inquired of each about a family member, pet, or other personal item. She watched each one find their desk with his/her name on it. She showed students who didn't recognize their names where their desk was located. (Field notes, 9/24/81)

When everyone was in his or her seat the teacher started a whole group session by asking them to fold their hands. Then she said: "We've got to get to know each other. You can call me Jeannie. I think LaSovage is a hard name to say." She introduced other adults in the room by their first names. Then she said, "If we are going to work together we've got to figure out how to be together. We spend so much of our life here at school. We'd better learn to be like a family when we're together. That means some things will be alright for us to do and some are not alright." Jeannie and the students took turns mentioning things to do and not to do. (Field notes, 9/24/81)

Jeannie then said "In this room sometimes we vote on things and sometimes we will try to get everyone to agree." She described what voting meant giving examples. A student asked if they can vote about what to do if someone "is not good." Jeannie asked everyone who wants to be good to raise their hand. Jeannie says "Everyone wants to be good so I don't think we'll have a problem..." (Field notes, 9/24/81)

Next Jeannie led a conversation about feelings. She used several personal examples to show the difference between "like" and "love." She asks children to give examples. After talking about distinction and relating the concepts to the pupils interpersonal relationships, she read the story Things I Like

After Jeannie finished the story she asked, "What is an illustrator? Does anyone know what an author is?" Several students raised their hands and before Jeannie could systematically call on everyone who raised their hand someone had defined author and someone had defined illustrator. Jeannie in each case asked other children to paraphrase the correct answer.

Jeannie then commented that the students will do some writing. This comment elicited some grumbles that Jeannie responded to by saying, "I don't think that is the right attitude." She then elaborated on the task, saying that in about two weeks the students would each have made a book that they can take home. She explained that today they would select a picture to write about.

Taped to the chalk board in front of the class were eight pictures. The pictures included: 1) children baking, 2) an adult and child hugging, 3) a boy hitting a baseball, 4) a child

in autumn woods, 5) children with an animal, 6) two children doing artwork in school, 7) father and son, and 8) child alone thinking. Jeannie asked the students to describe each picture or something the picture reminded them about.

Finally, Jeannie said that they were going to vote to pick the topic that they would write about. She explained that each child can vote only once. There were 25 students and after the first voting there were 29 votes. Jeannie said, "Please close your eyes and think about whether you voted one time or two times." Jeannie then went over the pictures once more and then reminded the students to raise their hand (vote) for one of the pictures. She said "raise your hand to vote for the picture that you want to write about today." The vote is held again and this time there are 25 votes. The title of the picture that won was "Family" (picture #4 above). (Field notes, 9/24/81 and interview 9/24/81)

The key characteristics which emerged during the first day of class included:

1. emphasis on student and teacher participation in decision making,
2. acceptance of a range of feelings but an emphasis on the transaction.
3. talk of class as family,
4. links to family via,
   a. writing assignment and
   b. homework,
5. self disclosure by adults
6. integration of social and academic skills building on themes during the morning (e.g., family, linking),
7. use of first names by everyone, and
8. pupil and leader statements about quality of behavior with specific examples provided.

These characteristics, identified during the first day of school, were the central advance organizers for this classroom's operations for the entire year. Of particular interest in this report is the advance organizer emphasizing participatory decision making. The decision making characteristic was observed during the year when members of the class did things such as:

1) give specific positive and negative feedback to each other (student/student, student/teacher, teacher/teacher), 2) vote on certain types of issues, 3) call class meetings (e.g., to discuss eliminating board work, group noise level, or explicate personal progress or achievement of objectives), and 4) plan collaborative curriculum content and instructional activities.

In summary, an early hypothesis pursued in this study was that the essential characteristic for building a learning community in the classroom involved teacher-pupil collaborative planning and/or problem solving sessions.

The organizers used to report what was observed to be occurring in the classroom studied are:

1. What happened during collaborative curriculum planning?
2. Why did the teacher hold collaborative planning sessions?
3. What did the teacher do to get ready for collaborative planning sessions? and
4. What resulted from collaborative planning sessions?

What Happened During Collaborative Curriculum Planning?

During the academic year of the research effort major collaborative curriculum and instructional strategy planning occurred on five occasions. Each occasion included eight steps as follows:

1. Step one involved the teacher describing a concrete experience in which everyone would participate and the teacher's rationale for suggesting the activity;
2. Step two involved the class doing the concrete activity (e.g., a treasure hunt, making applesauce);
3. Step three involved students answering who, what, where, when, why questions in both a group and individual experience story.
4. Step four included student writing an experience story about previous experiences related to the concrete experience topic;
5. Step five involved teacher and pupils answering two questions which led to the identification of the potential subject matter to be learned and ways it could be learned;

6. Step six involved meeting with pupils to identify specific tasks for which they would be held accountable;

7. Step seven involved the class collaboratively organizing the tasks, and

8. Step eight concluded with pupils and teacher specifying individual academic objectives.

Each of the eight steps for the collaboration planning sequence of class sessions is described in the following paragraph.

Step One. Jeannie told the students they were going to do something like "make applesauce". She explained to the students her interest in the activity and/or the topic it represented. For example, Jeannie included in her rationale about making applesauce how her personal interest in apples began and what became of the interest. She shared stories about growing up on an apple and vegetable farm. She shared examples of 1) when she was punished by her parents, 2) when she was praised by her parents, 3) what types of family events she liked, and 4) what knowledge related to the topic of study. From her description the students learned more about her upbringing, values, interests, shortcomings. (Interview 9-30-81)

Step Two. Jeannie and her students then participated in the concrete experience in this case, that of making applesauce. Jeannie calls this concrete experience "The Initiating Common Experience." During the time applesauce was being made and eaten Jeannie interacted with the students and made first observations of their language development, social and cooperation skills, writing and reading skills, and memory patterns. (Later Jeannie made notes on 3 X 5 cards about what she had learned. She then used the information collected to determine actual individual needs.) (See Step Eight)

Step Three. After the applesauce was eaten Jeannie and the students formally discussed the event. Three products that the students completed during the processing of the initiating common experience were based on the

students answering who, what, when, where, and why questions and producing both a collaborative experience story, and a written or verbal individual experience story.

Jeannie began the processing session by saying, "Can we appreciate diversity, welcome individual learning, and still develop one applesauce story?" Some of you can read, and some are learning to make a circle correctly. How can we all use this experience?" (Field Notes 10/2/81) Jeannie and her students then talked about what "appreciate" and "diversity", "cooperation" and "learning" meant. She then focused the discussion on the applesauce experience.

Through the discussion of the applesauce experience the students and teacher agreed on each word and each sentence for the group experience story. The teacher asked, for example, "what did we do to the apples?". The children responded with a vareity of suggestions, including "squish, squoosh, squash." The teacher then wrote the multiple word choices on the board and the students said each word, talked about what the words meant, if they were fun to say or hear, and what sounds would be studied in each word. The teacher then indicated which students would study which specific vowel combinations. In this case the students voted for the particular word they wished to incorporate in the story.

After the sentences had been agreed on and written, Jeannie wrote the words "Title" and "Author" above the story. The group then selected a title and decided how to tell who the author of the story was.

After the experience story was completed and written on the board, Jeannie completed the processing by having the students participate in reading and writing activities using the experience story. Jeannie employed this activity in order for students to become aware of the integration of reading and writing. Some of the activities she used were as follows:

1) Students copied story for handwriting grade;
2) Students individually learned to read story;
3) Cut story sentences apart and rearrange;
4) Cut individual words and make sentences and story;
5) Teacher assisted students in using story for needed word recognition/decoding skills, (i.e., find sight words they are studying, identify phonetic principle words, cvc, cvvc, ccvc, structural analysis, ed plurals...);
6) Use of story for word meanings (e.g., identify words they would like to make substitutions for with similar meaning words);
7) Sentence structure alterations--make sentences beginning with phrases, use of more then one noun verb;
8) Identified nouns/verbs/adjectives in story.

Step Four. Concurrently during the time when the whole group was "studying the experience story," the teacher met with individual students in order to write down their personal experience or their personal story as related to the initiating common experience (e.g., throwing rotten apples, making apple bark). Students dictated to the teacher who typed the story directly on a ditto. The dictating student was identified as the author. The finished personal stories were then analyzed by the teacher for their potential use as instructional materials. (See Study Episode)

Step Five. It was in this fifth step that the collaborative teacher and pupil development of the subject matter to be learned were formally developed. Having completed the processing stage, the teacher set the stage for a discussion and brainstorming session. In this step the teacher asked two distinct questions: a) What can we learn?, b) What can we do?

Question One: What can we learn? Jeannie first wrote titles of all the subject matter areas on the board. Then she initiated the collaborative curriculum development by asked questions such as: "Besides what we learned during the initiating common experience, what else do we know about apples? When do you find apples in the store? Why do adults say you can have an apple instead of a candy bar? If you brought an apple to eat at recess and your best friend wanted part of it how would you solve this problem?" (Interview 10/10/81).

As students responded to the questions, Jeannie provided direct guidance so that science ideas were classified on the board as science, math ideas as math, and so forth. In addition to the questions, Jeannie asked students to read their personal stories to the class as a method for generating additional ideas. For example, Christa read the following:

Author: Christa APPLE BARK

My mother and I like to make apple bark.
We use red delicious apples, a pan, a hot plate, a spoon and a cookie sheet.
We make the apple bark in our kitchen.
We make it in the fall. Usually we make it around Halloween time.
We make it because we all like it. We take it with us on walks and when we go in the car. It is a good snack.

After the story was read the children asked the student author questions. In the case of this class interaction two study topics were developed. One involved electricity, the interest emanating from the hot plate. The second idea grew into a study of healthy snacks (without preservatives). Having determined specific content that could be learned, the class then began to focus on the second question.

Question Two: What Can We Do? At this point the conversation moved to the specific questions for identifying activities. Now Jeannie's purpose was to generate ideas for other subject matter activities. As students made suggestions Jeannie responded in a supportive manner giving examples of what could be learned for the suggested activities. She then asked the students to classify their ideas under the appropriate subject matter title and she also added ideas, explaining to pupils how to classify them. When suggesting ideas she identified them as "when I was thinking about what we might do and wrote it down as a check list." (Field notes, 10-7-81) The result of this step was a large list of subject matter topics and activities. At this point the teacher considered the probability of pupil success if the planned study

was implemented. (See Improcess Decisions for further discussion) At this time the teacher also decided whether the pupils would work on a number of activities or whether everyone would participate at the same time in a given activity. (See Improcess Decisions)

Step Six. Having collaboratively identified content and potential tasks it became crucial that they also collaboratively identify the specific tasks for which a given individual student would be held accountable. Thus, in step six Jeannie and the pupils decided in which activities they would actually participate. A list of required tasks for each pupil was established. This collaboration was done in small groups, individually, and through whole group discussion.

Step Seven. When Jeannie decided that a single class activity would be used, then step seven involved the whole class defining the steps which would be followed for the completion of each task. During class discussion the teacher recorded the steps and subtasks on the board again and again as they were collaboratively reordered. She continued this until there was agreement on a sequence.

When multiple activities and subsets of the students were to work in the different areas, Jeannie met with each subset and did the same as above. For example, students choosing the focus on math as the primary area of study might begin organizing the series of measurement activities. The final part of step seven involved the development of a monitoring system. This system allowed the students the opportunity to check off and keep track of their task progress.

Step Eight. During the eighth step Jeannie and each student held a conference. The conference had two purposes. The first purpose was to identify the content and responsibility objectives for which students would be held accountable. To develop the entire list of objectives, Jeannie talked

with each student. During this conference she 1) told the pupil what observations were made about the student's independent work completed during the Initial Common Experience, 2) showed the child the written or taped work, 3) told the pupil specifically what the child currently could and couldn't do, and 4) gave both examples and non-examples of what the student would be able to do when learning has occurred. Next she and the pupil decided on how much the student would contract to do and how well the student would perform any specific objective. Criteria for cognitive objectives were negotiated in terms of "can get after thinking" or "says word immediately after seeing word card." Responsibility objectives were negotiated in terms of "initiating", "following through", "with X number of reminders", or "responding to observed cues or external teacher cues".

The second purpose of the conference was to determine the level at which students would perform. During this phase of the conference Jeannie and the student identified the level of accomplishment. Each pupil was told which level of knowledge she/he must demonstrate (e.g., practice, application, or transfer) for academic credit. Students who were being introduced to new content were usually held accountable for practice level demonstration. Students who had had practice accountability previously were moved to application. Jeannie recorded in her own record keeping system credit for any new knowledge/skill gained when the student was able to actually use it in a new situation. For example, one thing a student might be asked to do is demonstrate the difference between an exclamation point and a period by reading paragraphs indicating with voice and nonverbal expression the difference. During the year students became adept in defining their tasks as being instructional, practice, application or transfer in nature. When the student perceived she/he had achieved this level and wanted to move on in terms of

accountability, Jeannie evaluated them. Pupils who were ready chose a method for showing transfer.

Step eight ended with Jeannie and the pupil listing his/her objectives and figuring out a way for the pupils to keep track of his/her academic achievement. Thus both a task and content record keeping system were developed with the pupils.

The entire collaborative planning experience (Steps 1-8) took about 14-16 hours and was conducted across 7 or 8 days.

Why did the Teacher Hold Collaborative Planning Sessions?

The collaborative planning sessions are held because they are the process by which Jeannie implements her basic assumptions about teaching, learning, and the primary function of schooling. The primary function of schooling from her perspective is social and personal responsibility directly related to learning. The operating assumptions and Jeannie's role in optimizing this function of schooling are described in the following. The statement concerning Jeannie's assumptions are organized around the topics of students, learning, curriculum, evaluation, and her role as a teacher. The following also includes a description of the relationship of the collaborative planning sessions to the teacher role.

Assumptions

A. Students.
   Students enjoy learning.
   Students who participate in planning their own outcomes and related activities are more likely to achieve.
   Students will become responsible learners if given the opportunity and then held accountable for the responsible behavior.
   Students will behave appropriately when taught how to distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate behavior for a given setting.
   Students have a responsibility to help other students learn.

B. Learning.
Socialization (a la Piaget) that is working with others, is necessary for learning.
Heterogeneous grouping and acceptance of diversity is necessary for genuine socialization.

C. Curriculum.
Content which has some direct relationship to the students' previous concrete experiences has the most potential for being learned.
Integration of content provides students with learning experiences that are closer to out of school (real life) application experiences.
Curriculum based on integration of content has naturally incorporated the principle of teaching for transfer.

D. Evaluation.
Evaluation of academic achievement is based on the individual's performance.
Evaluation of group task completion must include: cooperation; participation by all members; and meeting subject matter demands.
Evaluation must occur at both formative and summative levels.

E. Teacher Role.
The teacher teaches.
The teacher holds a position of authority and responsibility.
The teacher speaks as an experienced and mature adult.
The teacher retains the ultimate accountability and decision making power.
The teacher solicites input.
The teacher seeks group consensus.
The teacher communicates rationales for decisions to pupils.
The teacher communicates decisions to pupils.

Jeannie's leadership style can be classified as authoritative (Brophy and Putnam, 1979). From Jeannie's point of view, the students' contributions during the collaborative planning sessions helped her fulfill her role by providing her information about 1) where to start a topic of study so that it was based on the links that could be made with students' previous concrete experiences, 2) what internal motivation related to topic and tasks was present for each child which suggested pupil links with activities that would make use of the natural interests, 3) who was initiating, responding, or not participating in which activities. All this information was used in her teacher decisions

concerning leadership, seating, necessary interpersonal instruction, and content instruction and evaluation. Thus, this teacher held collaborative planning sessions because they were essential to both her and the pupils' success. (Interview 3/12/81)

What Did the Teacher Do To Get Ready for Collaborative Planning?

The planning and related decisions which this teacher did alone occurred at two specific times. The first, Preplanning, occurred before a new topic was considered by the group in the collaborative planning session. The second, In-process Planning Decisions, occurred after the collaborative planning step six.

Preplanning. The planning which the teacher completed before she began the collaborative planning sessions included a conscious review of what she knew about the 1) curriculum, 2) objectives, 3) students, and 4) classroom school and community resources. In addition, at the beginning of the school year the teacher reviewed the student records and any new texts or materials which had become part of the school curriculum since the previous year.

Based on her initial synthesis of this information the teacher identified those pupil outcomes for which she would hold herself accountable. At the time she developed a recording system for her use in documenting the pupils' achievement of objectives. This recording system was reviewed each time a major change in study occurred. The updating helped the teacher " ... keep in mind what needed to be worked on while she was planning alone and also with the pupils" (interview 3/12/81). After the mental review the teacher then selected a topic for study. Next she gathered any additional information she felt she needed to develop the topic into an area for study. The teacher then decided on the initiating common experience.

Once the topic and concrete experience had been chosen the teacher listed potentially related activities. This process resulted in the teacher

having 1) identified an area of study, 2) synthesized relative knowledge, 3) listed pupil outcomes, and 4) listed possible activities. The teacher did not make any final decisions about the plans at this time. Instead she kept the decision tentative until the point of the first in-process planning decision.

In-Process Planning Decisions. The first in-process teacher decisions occurred after Step 5 in the collaborative planning sessions. After the collaborative discussions concerning content and activities, the teacher decided whether there were enough ties from the students' life experiences to the new content. She also determined if there was sufficient interest exhibited by students to pursue the particular area of study. Should the answer be no, a new concrete experience was identified and the process started again. If the answer was yes then the teacher made a second decision.

The second decision made by the teacher occurred when the teacher and pupils had identified potential knowledge and skills to be learned from a specific topic of study and what activities could be done. The teacher then made a decision as to whether the pupils would have the option to choose among activities or work as an entire class on a single activity. Once these in-process decisions were made they were communicated to the pupils and the teacher and class were ready for an extended period of study.

What Resulted From Collaborative Planning Sessions?

Three outcomes of the collaborative planning sessions were observed. First, the pupils studied the unit as planned for a period of time which was referred to as the "study episode." Second, the plan as implemented included built in opportunities for diverse instruction and working relationships. Third, pupils and teacher used the collaborative planning process to off-task behavior as well as content objectives and strategies.

Study Episode. Approximately eight days after the class participated in a concrete common experience they were ready to begin an extensive study episode.. The study episode period was the time when students completed activities and academic objectives as planned. Both task and academic objectives were adjusted during the study when Jeannie and a pupil determined they were inappropriate. Alternative tasks and objectives were immediately identified. The study periods lasted from eight to eighteen days depending on the pace and motivation of the teacher and pupils.

Each day's study period was organized into three sections. These 3 sections were 1) tasking, 2) working, 3) closing. Section one was used for sharing news from outside of the classroom and tasking individuals. The second section of the class included whole/small groups or individuals directed instruction and work time. The third section of time involved a review of the group behavior and progress of individuals, reminders about home tasks and planning for the next day.

During the study episode period, as more and more students completed their activities and objectives, Jeannie would hold a discussion with the class to set a "closing date" for the current study. By the closing date all pupils were evaluated to determine the progress they had made. Daily class discussions were held during the close down period of time. Pupils shared with each other the new knowledge and skills they had acquired (e.g., reading with voice inflection, reading a story the pupil had authored, telling how many sight words one had accomplished). Pupils who had not completed tasks or objectives held conferences with Jeannie to determine causes (e.g., didn't attend to class, wrong or too many objectives chosen) for their situation. These conferences always ended with an agreement between the teacher and the pupil to try to make better decisions next time.

Diverse Working Relationships. Daily during the study episodes students worked individually, in pairs, in small groups, in the whole group and with and/or without teacher directed instruction. The teacher came into instructional contact with each student each day. Individual contact ranged from eight seconds to several minutes in length. Students helped each other and were helped by others at various times. Recess came in the middle of the work session and the number of pupils who left the room averaged 10 out of 25. The students who stayed to work and those who went out varied. As one first grader explained, "I stay in when I want to learn and I go out when I want to play." (Interview Notes, 10/81)

Diverse Off-Task Behavior. Off-task student behavior during study periods was virtually non-existent. When it did occur it involved such things as 1) a student saying s/he didn't feel well and being left alone to sit in his/her seat, 2) a student who entered the group later in the year and attended to work for part of the time and then walked around, 3) brief social conversations between students passing each other on their way to do something task related, and 4) personal needs.

When disrupting off-task behavior occurred a class meeting was called. It was initiated by the pupil or teacher flicking the lights to get everyone's attention and then stating the problem. For example, a pupil said "There is so much talking in here I can't work at my desk" (Field notes 10/7/81) or the teacher said "Seven people have interrupted Susan and me and I can't help her" (Field notes 10/7/81). The problem statement was followed by a question asking people to recall if the problem had been discussed previously and if so what had been said. When it appeared to be a new problem individuals were asked to say what they were doing to be disruptive and to explain why. Finally the teacher would ask "What are we going to do about this?" The teacher never

suggested the first solution. Once possible solutions were generated then specific changes in behavior were identified and related directly to the teacher and specific pupils. These types of collaborative sessions did not occur after the end of October as the need disappeared.

During the study episode period as more and more students completed their activities and objectives Jeannie would hold a discussion with the class to set a "closing date" for the current study. By the closing date all pupils were evaluated to determine the progress they had made. Daily class discussions were held during the close down period of time. Pupils shared with each other the new knowledge and skills they had acquired (e.g., reading with voice inflection, reading a story the pupil had authored, telling how many sight words one had accomplished). Pupils not completing tasks or objectives held conferences with Jeannie to determine causes (e.g., didn't attend to class, wrong or too many objectives chosen) for their situation. These conferences always ended with an agreement that both Jeannie and the pupil would try to make better decisions next time.

In Summary

In this classroom, collaborative planning was the key characteristic which contributed to the learning community environment. This is a classroom where children are hooked on learning. In this classroom the children participate in cooperation with the teacher in making decisions about what and how they will study.

The major influence on this learning community teacher's planning was her philosophical position. The nature of this teacher's planning can be described as mental selection of information to be processed, mental processing, mental decision making and note writing and record keeping.

The selection of information included the mental assessment of learner's, resources, teacher, cognitive outcomes, and personal and social responsibility outcomes. The processing included identification and writing of long range outcomes. It also included the mental organization of a particular but tentative curriculum with objectives consistent with the long range outcomes. The processing also included written unit planning notes. A major part of the information processing was the mental planning in collaboration with the students. This mental planning involved reflection on the unit plan and simultaneous revisions and adaptations of that plan. This part of the mental planning also involved linking specific students to objectives. Next the written planning of lessons with pupils (notes originally put on board) occurred. Notes were recorded at later times concerning student behaviors and the sequences of activities were put in a lesson schedule book. These acted as reminders to the teacher. During instruction the teacher reflected on specified individual student outcomes and the student's behavior. Based on this processing, decisions to change a student's objectives were made during the study episode.

At the culmination of a study episode the new pupil data was considered in the teacher's reflection and assessment planning for the next unit of instruction. The teacher constructed the next units of instruction to pick up on individual achievement as it was at the end of the last study episode.

Section III
Implications for Teacher Education

As was described earlier, the major influence on this learning community teacher's planning was her philosophical position. The nature of this teacher's planning can be described as mental a) mental selection of information to be processed, b) mental processing, c) mental decision making, and d) note writing and record keeping.

A primary implication of this study for teacher educators who wish to teach their students how to plan for a learning community classroom is that the key aspects of planning are: 1) knowing curriculum and long range goals, 2) knowing a particular set of students and the developmental characteristics of students, 3) knowing where a given piece of curriculum fits into the year's long range picture, and 4) knowing how to synthesize knowledges to form a meaningful curriculum. As it pertains to a learning community classroom this study does not support the case that objectives are not thought of or important to teachers. This study supports the case that objectives are not derived solely from curriculum materials, and that they are necessary for effective planning and implementation of a learning community.

This study does suggest that teacher educators who wish to change the content of their courses on planning should take into consideration several elements. First, the teacher educator needs to identify what type of classroom outcomes they are instructing teachers to plan for. Second, teacher educators must understand the beliefs and values that the different interaction patterns which contribute to different outcomes. Fourth, they need to know activities and strategies which will promote specified outcomes. Fifth, teacher educators must know how to do and how to teach others to do long range planning based on specified outcomes. Sixth, teacher educators will need to know how to identify entry characteristics and growth patterns for individuals. Finally, teacher educators must be able to teach their students how to negotiate specific objectives in light of long range goals, learners, and available resources. Consideration of these elements results in planning being viewed as a dynamic process with objectives functioning in fluid sense.

The learning community teacher who was the subject of this study held a philosophical view that the classroom would be a learning community.

This philosophical view influenced what information she selected to process, how she processed the information and the decisions she made. The philosophical view she held influenced her decision about what to teach, how to teach and what the academic, social and personal responsibility outcomes were for learners.

McCutcheon (1980) indicates that there are two sets of questions concerning teacher planning which must be considered. One set of questions is concerned with the nature of and influences on teacher planning as it is occurring today. The second set of questions is concerned with what should teachers consider as they plan.

Studies of teacher planning and thinking by McCutcheon (1980), McClune (1971), Kyle (1980) and others (e.g., Clark and Yinger, 1979; Clark and Elmore, 1979, NcNaire and Joyce, 1979; Kyle, 1980; Merriman, 1976) illustrate two major points. First, when planning teachers do not select the same information to process, nor do they process information exactly the same way, and the resulting decisions about what and how to teach are not the same. The second point is that we don't know what it is that influences teachers to select information, process it, and arrive at decisions all of which differ across teachers. There is some evidence (Kyle 1980) that a number of factors influence teachers' planning (e.g., personal interests, education). We suggest that the question of what influences teacher planning be studied further. We recommend that in future studies special consideration be given to the identification of teachers' philosophical positions and their beliefs and values concerning the roles of teacher and pupil. The question of what teachers should consider in planning then can be considered in light of the knowledge of teacher purposes.

In this study of a learning community teacher, Jeannie LaSovage, we were able to identify teacher philosophy, teacher beliefs and values, teacher planning procedures, implementation of plans and students outcomes. Based

on our experience with this learning community teacher, it is our recommendation that teacher educators need to consider for their instruction philosphically consistent models of curriculum development rather than generic and technical planning skills.

References

Barnes, H., Burke, J.B., and Putnam, J. The Learning Community. A Research Proposal, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich. Unpublished paper, 1979.

Bossert, S.T. Tasks and Social Relationships in Classrooms, A Study of Instructional Organization and Its Consequences. Cambridge University, N.Y., 1979.

Clark, C.M. and Elmore, J.L. Teacher Planning in the First Weeks of School. Institute for Research on Teaching, Research Series No. 56, East Lansing, Mich., 1979.

Clark, C. and Yinger, R. Three Studies of Teacher Planning, Institute for Research on Teaching, Research Series No. 55, East Lansing, Mich, 1979.

Clark, C., and Yinger, R. The Hidden World of Teaching: Implications of Research on Teacher Planning, Institute for Research on Teaching, Research Series No. 77, East Lansing, Mich., 1980.

Clark, C., and Yinger, R. Research on Teacher Thinking, Institute for Research on Teaching, Research Series No. 12, East Lansing, Mich., 1978.

Edelfelt, R., Rethinking Teacher Education, NEA, Washington, 1975.

Erickson, F., "Some Approaches to Inquiry in School-Community Ethnography", Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 8, 2, pgs. 58-63, 1977.

Erickson, F. and Schultz, J. "When is a Context? Some Issues and Methods in the Analysis of Social Competence", Institute for Comparative Human Development, 1977.

Evertson, C., and Anderson, L., Classroom Organization at the Beginning of School: Two Case Studies, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1978.

Gil, D. The Decision-Making and Diagnostic Processes of Classroom Teachers, Institute for Research on Teaching, Research Series No. 71, East Lansing, Mich., 1980.

Harvey, O.J., Prather, M.J., White, B., Alter, R.O., and Hoffmeister, J.K. Teachers' belief systems and preschool atmospheres. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1966, 57, 373-381.

Johnson, D., and Johnson, R., Learning Together and Alone, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Johnson, D., Johnson, R., and Skon, L., Student Achievement on Different Types of Tasks Under Cooperative, Competitive, and Individualistic Conditions, Contemporary Educational Psychology, Vol. 4, 99-106, 1979.

Joyce, B., and Showers, B. Teacher training research: Working hypotheses for program design and directions for further study. Presented AERA National Conference, April 1981.

King, A.R., "The Teacher as a Participant-Observer: A Case Study", Approaches to the Study of Schools and Classrooms, N.Y., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Kyle, D.W., "Curriculum Decisions: Who Describes What?" The Elementary School Journal, Vol. 81, No. 2, The University of Chicago, 1980.

McCall, G.J., and Simmons, J.L., Issues in Participant Observation: A Text and Reader, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, Mass., 1969.

McClune, R.R., The Development of an Analytical Framework and Survey Questionnaire To Identify and Classify the Instructional Planning Activities of Elementary Teachers, Dissertation Abstracts International, 32 (1971), 308-A.

McCutcheon, G., "How Do Elementary Teachers Plan? The Nature of Planning and Influences on It", The Elementary School Journal, Vol. 81, No. 1, The University of Chicago, Chicago 1980.

Merriman, E.L., Considerations Identified by Elementary Teachers as Elements of Their Planning for Instructional Activities, Dissertation Abstracts International, 36 (1976), 4420-A.

Morine-Dershimer. Teacher Plan and Classroom Reality: The South Bay Study, Part IV, Institute for Research on Teaching, Research Series No. 60, East Lansing, Mich., 1979.

O'Daffer, P.G., "Individualized Instruction--A Search for a Humanized Approach." The Arithmetic Teacher , Vol. 23, 23-28, 1976.

Oja, S.N. Deriving teacher educational objectives from cognitive developmental theories and applying them to the practice of teacher education. Paper presented at AERA National Conference, April 1981.

Robinson, M.L. An Experiment in Teaching Group-Cooperation on Mathematics Tasks, Paper presented at the 76th Annual SSMA Convention, Toledo, Ohio, November 12, 1976.

Schatzman, L., and Strauss, A.L., Field Research, Strategies for a Natural Sociology, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1973.

Schwab, J.J. "Education and The State: Learning Community", The Great Ideas Today, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1976.

Schwille, J., Porter, A., Gant, M., Belli, G., Floden, R., Freeman, D., Knappen, L., Kuhs, T., and Schmidt, W. Factors Influencing Teachers' Decisions About What to Teach: Sociological Perspectives, Institute for Research on Teaching, Research Series No. 62, East Lansing, Mich., 1979.

Stanford, Gene. Developing Effective Classroom Groups, Hart Publishing Co., N.Y., 1977.

Thies-Sprinthall, L. Supervision: An educative or mis-educative process? Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 31, no. 4, 1980, 17-20.

Wolf, R.L., and Tymitz, B., Toward More Natural Inquiry in Education, Bloomington, Indiana, University Press, 1977.